

REMARKS

Claims 1-12 are pending and stand rejected in the present application.

Examiner has noted that the Declaration is missing the date of signature from the inventor Bill Serra. MPEP Section 602.05 addressing date of execution of an Oath or Declaration states:

The Office no longer checks the date of execution of the oath or declaration and the Office will no longer require a newly executed oath or declaration based on an oath or declaration being stale (that is when the date of execution is more than 3 months prior to the filing date of the application) or where the date of execution has been omitted.

Accordingly, Applicants submit that the submitted Declaration is a properly executed document under MPEP Section 602.05.

The specification has been objected to for using reference numeral 112 to reference a video stream selection unit and a video mixing unit. The typographical error has been corrected by replacing the paragraph located at page 3, lines 3-7 of the specification with a Replacement Paragraph correctly using reference numeral 114 to reference the video mixing unit. The specification has also been objected to for failing to spell out a number of abbreviations. The paragraph located at page 6, lines 19-31 of the specification has been replaced with a Replacement Paragraph spelling out the abbreviations noted by the Examiner. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the objections to the specification be withdrawn.

Claims 9-12 stand rejected under 35 USC 101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claim 9 has been amended to recite "*A computer readable medium for storing a computer program comprising program code instructing a computer to perform a method of monitoring a location*" and claims 10-12 have been amended to recite "*The computer readable medium as claimed in claim 9.*" Since claims 9-12 have been amended to recite a computer readable medium thereby permitting the recited computer program's functionality to be

realized, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 9-12 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter be withdrawn.

Claims 1, 2, 4-6, 8-10, and 12 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Crain (U.S. Patent No. 4,962,473) in view of Monroe et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2002/0097322). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of claims 1, 2, 4-6, 8-10 and 12 as being unpatentable over Crain in view of Monroe et al.

Independent claim 1 and claims 2 and 4 dependent thereon, recite a monitoring system including *inter alia* a plurality of sensor elements, a plurality of cameras, a display unit, a navigation unit and a processing unit. The plurality of sensor elements are for distribution at a location and the plurality of cameras are for capturing video data of the location. The display unit is for displaying a graphical representation of a network of the sensor elements throughout the location and a video stream from any one of the cameras. The navigation unit is for navigating through the network of sensor elements displayed by the display unit. The processing unit is for selecting one of the cameras as the source of the video stream based on a current navigation position in the network of sensor elements.

Independent claim 5 and claims 6 and 8 dependent thereon, recite methods of monitoring a location and independent claim 9 and claims 10 and 12 dependent thereon, recite computer readable mediums for storing a computer program comprising program code instructing a computer to perform a method of monitoring a location. Monitoring data is obtained from a plurality of sensor elements distributed at the location and video data of the location is captured utilizing a plurality of cameras. The methods further include navigating through a network of the sensor elements, displaying a graphical representation of a current navigation position in the network of sensor elements and simultaneously displaying a video stream from one of the cameras selected based on the current navigation position.

Crain generally discloses an emergency action system that includes a subsystem for monitoring and controlling security at a facility (col. 4, lines 59-61). A plurality of video cameras, sensors, and actuators are distributed throughout the facility. The emergency action system includes a number of user consoles, where each user console includes a left monitor for presenting imagery from selected surveillance video cameras and a right monitor for presenting an alarm map showing the particular types and locations of the different alarms distributed throughout the facility (FIG. 5b). Camera view selection switches and camera controls are mounted beneath the left monitor. (col. 12, lines 21-30). Each user console further includes a third display for displaying a graphical user interface to the emergency action system. Controls, such as for example, a mouse or window control pad, enable a user to interact with the graphical user interface. (col. 12, lines 50-64). The graphical user interface displayed on the third console enables a user to control the operation of the sensors and actuators and the alarm map displayed on the right display monitor provides insight into the specific locations of particular sensors and actuators in the facility (col. 17, lines 15-36).

Crain does not suggest or disclose navigating through a displayed network of sensor elements, selecting one of the cameras at the location as the source of a video stream based on a current navigation position in the network of sensor elements, and displaying the video stream. In fact, in Crain, the disclosed graphical representation of the alarm map is not even an interactive display and cannot be used to select one of the cameras at the location as the source of a video stream for display. Crain teaches the use of camera view selection switches to select one of the cameras at the location as the source of a video stream for display.

Applicant respectfully submits that the above-stated deficiencies of the disclosure of Crain with respect to claims 1, 2, 4-6, 8-10, and 12 are not cured by the disclosure of Monroe et al.

Monroe et al. generally discloses a system for selectively displaying a video stream generated by one of a plurality of cameras distributed throughout a facility. A primary screen window includes a map window and a video window. The map window contains a map of the facility including a plurality of camera icons and a plurality of sensor icons where each icon represents the location of the associated camera or sensor within the facility (paragraph 19). When a user positions a mouse pointer over a camera icon or a sensor icon in the map of the facility displayed in the map window for a brief period of time, a bubble appears containing the associated camera or sensor name (paragraph 21, 22). To display the video stream associated with a specific camera, the user selects the camera by double clicking on the camera icon associated with that camera from the map of the facility displayed in the map window and the video stream generated by the selected camera is displayed in the video window (paragraph 21).

Monroe et al. does not suggest or disclose navigating through a displayed network of sensor elements, selecting one of the cameras at the location as the source of a video stream *based on a current navigation position in the network of sensor elements*, and displaying the video stream. In contrast, Monroe et al. displays a bubble with the name of the camera or sensor associated with a camera icon or sensor icon based on a current navigation position in the map of the facility. When a user wishes to view an area of the facility, the user identifies the camera that provides a view of that area of the facility, and selects the identified camera by double clicking on the associated camera icon in the map of the facility. Merely positioning a cursor over the associated camera icon does not result in the display of the video stream generated by the identified camera in the video window. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 1, 2, 4-6, 8-10, and 12 as being unpatentable over Crain in view of Monroe et al. be withdrawn.

Claims 3, 7, and 11 stand rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Crain and in view of Monroe et al. and Jacoby (US Patent No. 5,768,552). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of claims 3, 7, and 11 as being unpatentable over Crain in view of Monroe et al. and further in view of Jacoby.

Claims 3, 7, and 11 depend from independent claims 1, 5, and 9, respectively, and therefore include the elements recited in independent claims 1, 5, and 9, respectively. Applicants respectfully submit that the above-stated deficiencies of the disclosures of Crain and Monroe et al. are not cured by the disclosure of Jacoby.

Jacoby generally discloses generating a graphical representation of network topology and traffic activity within the network using a network map window and a viewing window (col. 6, lines 48-50). The network map window is used to display a reduced scale version of the entire network topology. A user manipulates a yellow window within the network map window and the area of the network map enclosed with the area of the yellow window is displayed in the viewing window. A control device, such as for example a cursor control device, can be used to manipulate the position of the yellow window in the network map window (col. 8 line 38 – col. 9 line 8).

Jacoby does not suggest or disclose navigating through a displayed network of sensor elements, and selecting one of the cameras at the location as the source of a video stream based on a current navigation position in the network of sensor elements, and displaying the video stream as recited by the claims at issue. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 3, 7, and 11 as being unpatentable over Crain in view of Monroe et al. and further in view of Jacoby be withdrawn.


Since the prior art does not disclose each of the elements recited by the claims at issue, it follows that such claims are not anticipated thereby.

Furthermore, the prior art does not disclose or suggest that it would be desirable or even possible to navigate through a displayed network of sensor

elements, select one of the cameras at the location as the source of a video stream based on a current navigation position in the network of sensor elements, and display the video stream as recited by the claims at issue. It is therefore evident that the claims are not obvious thereover. The prior art must disclose at least a suggestion of an incentive for the claimed combination of elements in order for a prima facie case of obviousness to be established. See *In re Sernaker*, 217 U.S.P.Q. 1 (Fed. Cir. 1983) and *Ex Parte Clapp*, 227 U.S.P.Q. 972, 973 (Bd. Pat. App. 1985). Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 1-12 be withdrawn.

For the foregoing reasons, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of the claims at issue and allowance thereof are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

By: 
Manisha Chakrabarti
Attorney Reg. No. 41,665

Manisha Chakrabarti
Attorney at Law
3108 South Route 59, Suite 124-282
Naperville, Illinois 60564
Telephone: (630) 355-3376

Date: April 13, 2007